

REMARKS

Summary

This Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mailed on April 21, 2004. Claims 56, 81-84, and 89 are amended. Claims 80 and 99-110 are cancelled. Claims 56-79 and 81-98 are pending.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 61, 80-85, 89, 91, and 92 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 56, 57, 62, 68, 86, 93 and 97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Livesay (US 5,837,185).

Claims 56-58, 62, 63, 65-74, 77, 78, 86-88, 90, 93, 94 and 97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer (US 4,942,013) in view of Livesay.

Claims 59 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Livesay in view of King (US 5,528,155).

Claim 64 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Livesay in view of FR 2 771 960.

Claim 75 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Livesay in view of Walsh (US 5,210,499).

Claim 76 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Livesay in view of Holtzberg (US 5,849,229).

Claim 79 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Livesay in view of Russell (US 4,201,823).

Claim 95 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Livesay in view of Wejrock (US 5,256,366).

Claim 96 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Livesay in view of Brown (H465).

Claim 98 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Livesay in view of Tunis (US 6,159,414).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the amended claims and the comments which follow.

#### Discussion of Amended Claims

Claim 56 is amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 80. Claim 80 is cancelled to avoid duplication of claimed subject matter. Claims 81-83 are amended to depend from claim 56 rather than cancelled claim 80.

Claim 84, which the Examiner has indicated includes allowable subject matter, has been amended into independent form by including the subject matter of claim 56.

Claim 89, which the Examiner has indicated includes allowable subject matter, has been amended into independent form by including the subject matter of claim 56 and intervening claims 87 and 86.

Withdrawn claims 99-110 are cancelled to place the application into condition for allowance.

Therefore, each of the present claims now includes allowable subject matter as indicated by the Examiner, or depends from a claim containing such allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are now in condition for immediate allowance.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicant's claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the amended claims and the above discussion. Applicant's silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this application, allow each of the presently pending claims, and to pass this application on to an early issue. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. McAllister  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37,886  
Law Office of Barry R. Lipsitz  
755 Main Street  
Monroe, CT 06468  
(203) 459-0200

**ATTY DOCKET NO.: HOE-603**

Date: June 17, 2004